

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/728,170	12/01/2000	Robert A. Luciano	732.454 SDG.CON	732.454 SDG.CON 3874	
21707 75	590 07/15/2003				
IAN F. BURNS & ASSOCIATES			EXAMINER		
RENO, NV 89	CHI LANE, SUITE 222 9502		. WILLIAMS	, KEVIN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2854		
		DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003		i	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Z			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	09/728,170	LUCIANO ET AL			
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit			
The MAN INC DATE of this accomplisation and	Kevin D. Williams	2854			
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on in cover sn it with in it	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 h</u>	Nay 2003 .				
	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under the second sec					
Disposition of Claims	_				
4) Claim(s) <u>22-69</u> is/are pending in the applicatio					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 22-69 is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	r alaction requirement				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	election requirement.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ſ.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep		miner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disappro	oved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.				
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 °					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) The translation of the foreign language pro					
Attachment(s)	·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

Application/Control Number: 09/728,170

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22- 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 22 and 37 recite "the printer system is accessible from the secure first compartment." It does not appear that the printer is actually accessible from the secure compartment, rather it appears that the locking mechanism is accessible from the secure compartment. The term "accessible" in the claims is unclear. After unlocking the printer in the secure compartment, a user would actually "access" or pull the printer out from the unsecured or printer compartment.

Claim 41 recites "when the door is in a closed position, the door limits removal of the printer." It does not appear that the door actually limits removal of the printer, rather it appears that the locking mechanism limits removal of the printer. If the locking mechanism were in an unlocked state or removed from the device altogether, the removal of the printer would not be limited at all by closing the door.

Claim 53 recites "wherein opening the door provides at least partial access to the printer." This limitation renders the scope of the claim indefinite. It does not appear that opening the door provides at least partial access to the printer, rather it appears that

Application/Control Number: 09/728,170 Page 3

Art Unit: 2854

opening the door provides at least partial access to the locking mechanism. If the door is open and the locking mechanism is in the locked position, the printer would not be partially accessible.

Claim 65 recites "wherein access to the printer is limited by the door." This limitation renders the scope of the claim indefinite. It does not appear that access to the printer is limited by the door, rather it appears that access to the locking mechanism is limited by the door. If the locking mechanism were in an unlocked state or removed from the device altogether, the accessibility of the printer would not be limited at all by the door.

Claim 67 recites "the door being attached to the second compartment and covering the opening and limiting removal of the printer; opening the door; and at least partially removing the printer from the first compartment." This limitation renders the scope of the claim indefinite. It does not appear that the door actually limits removal of the printer, rather it appears that the locking mechanism limits removal of the printer. If the locking mechanism were in an unlocked state or removed from the device altogether, the removal of the printer would not be limited at all by the door covering the opening.

The examiner is unable to ascertain the scope of the claims and therefore prior art has not been applied.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin D. Williams whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 2854

305-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

KDW July 14, 2003

ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800